

### That "Ungodly League" Editorial of the "New York Voice".

The most significant thing that has ever occurred in Prohibition politics, of which I know, is that editorial of our national Prohibition organ, The New York Voice, on "The ungodly league of the Church and Saloon", and the sympathetic response from Prohibition papers and Prohibition workers all over the country.

The substance of the editorial is that the church is the bulwark of the rum traffic, that Christians who believe in Prohibition should withdraw from these churches, and either establish churches of their own, or just live in the Prohibition party as being better than the church in its present form, and use the money that they have been giving to churches, for the Prohibition party.

It not only takes the position that no man is a Christian who votes with the old political parties, but says of any preacher who is even silent on the Prohibition question that he is not fit for a teacher of the people.

Nothing can be any more self-evidently right than the whole tenor of the Voice's editorial. In all the church member voters of the United States there are twenty out of every twenty-one who vote for the liquor traffic. That the church thus becomes the bulwark of the liquor traffic is indisputable. The Prohibitionist then who gives twenty-one cents to the church gives twenty cents to help the church beat Prohibition, and one cent to help Prohibition beat the church and its ally the saloon.

One of the most efficient ways, therefore, to beat Prohibition is to strengthen the church by giving it money.

Of course we all know that our Prohibition voters are largely church members, but the liquor voters are much more largely church members, and if the fact that Prohibition voters have come from the church proves that the church is the friend of Prohibition, the fact that all of these voters have come from the Democratic and Republican parties would also prove that those two rotten old political parties are friends of Prohibition.

It twenty out of every twenty-one church members vote against Prohibition, as they undoubtedly do, if there are 5,200,000 church members in the United States, and only 250,000 of them vote for Prohibition then, by mathematical demonstration the church is the enemy of Prohibition. If all these Christian voters except 250,000 vote as the liquor dealers want them to do, then of course the church is the friend and ally of the liquor dealer. There is no use of debating that question any longer.

The papers published in the liquor interest never have any complaint to make of the church. They pick out the few scattering ministers and laymen who oppose the liquor traffic, and these papers call them fools and hypocrites; but they brag on the church and print the sermons of the preachers who say anything against Prohibition.

If there is any conscience in the church, such a withdrawal of Prohibitionists from its fold would be the most effective mode of arousing it.

If we have left the old political parties because they were corrupt and immoral and pledged to support the liquor traffic, I can not see what consistency Prohibitionists can stay in the churches, all of which are just as earnest in the support of the liquor traffic.

There's no sense in telling about all the splendid resolutions that the different churches are passing in favor of temperance and Prohibition. Its all poppycock, and intended to humbug somebody, just like the Republican party passes temperance resolutions.

The church people and the Republicans who pass the resolutions are nothing but a lot of liars and at the very time they are passing them intend to vote for the liquor traffic at the next election.

I can not conceive of a man who is a Christian for the sake of encouraging the Christian virtues, and doing good to his fellow men, as not being a Prohibitionist.

I would love more than anything that I can imagine, to see all Christians who are such simply for the good they can do, combine in one great church, to be called simply "The Christian church," and this proposition of the New York Voice for the Prohibitionists to combine themselves in a church is the first intimation I have seen for a nucleus for the re-establishment of Christianity for the purpose for which it was intended by its founder.

I hope that Prohibitionists will withdraw their financial support from the present form of the church and devote it to the Prohibition cause, until they can organize a church that is in keeping with the Christian code of morals.

### Bro. Neal of "The Worker", and I can not Edit the Blade Together.

In the last issue of the Blade I said that Bro. Neal, editor of "The Worker" and I would probably associate in the editing of the Blade.

He has been kind and generous in all that he has said and done about going into the arrangement, but I do not now think it would be best for us to do so, and he says he will not be put to any inconvenience by anything that has been said or done, if we do not now consummate the arrangement.

I believe he is a good man, and perhaps have no right to say that he is not as honest in his religious convictions as I am. But as an abstract proposition I believe I would be giving too much of a sop to the Ecclesiastic Cerberus to subordinate my opinions to his when he is my junior in years and does not claim to be my senior in theological or classic scholarship.

The whole country is full of editors of his theological views and I believe I am the only Rationalistic editor of a Prohibition paper, in the world.

That a revolution in religious sentiment is brewing among Christians is, to me, quite as evident as that such a revolutionary sentiment is growing in politics.

These two sentiments are going hand in hand, and they propose to accomplish not only Prohibition but much more for the world. These sentiments are going to be immensely more liberal than now.

The religion and politics of the future will consist in doing good to our fellow men, and faith, that is now the great matter in religion, will be little regarded.

The trend of the most competent religious thought now is to divert the Christian religion of the miracle and supernaturalism that surround the teachings of all those great masters, and to accept and practice and inculcate those moral precepts which it teaches, which are the outgrowth of ages, and which now, more than ever before are pressing their truth upon our acceptance.

I can not better express myself on this subject than I have done in the preface to my book, "The Rational View", which says: "But as England and America owe to Lycurgus and Justinian and Blackstone a debt of gratitude for the civil law which 'naturalis ratio inter omnes homines constituit', which they did not invent, but only compiled and codified, so do we of this most enlightened age that the sun has shown upon, owe to Jesus the carpenter of Nazareth, an inestimable debt of gratitude for the impress of ideas that stands stamped upon all of our highest institutions as plain as the lion and unicorn trade mark is upon the English goods that comes to our shores."

Unfettered by the ignorance and bigotry and superstition that ancient and modern hired priestcraft has found it to its interest to throw around the life of Jesus, his character would, to-day, stand out fresh and beautiful to every intelligent man and woman, as the picture of some great master, just cleansed of the smoke of censers and whitewash on the walls of some ivy-grown cathedral of Europe."

Not only would Bro. Neal and I be ungenial on the question of theology which is daily more and more asserting itself in Prohibition discussion, and will, before a great while, "split" the churches; but he and I would be sadly inharmonious on the question of woman's suffrage.

In a letter from him that I have just received he speaks of woman's suffrage as "a greater menace to homes than saloons".

I could not, and would not, stand one single editorial utterance of that kind in any newspaper on which my name was to appear as editor.

The man who can say that either does not appreciate that which is ugly in saloons, or that which is beautiful in woman, as I do.

If there is any merit at all in my newspaper it is that I say what, at the time, I honestly believe, absolutely regardless of consequences. I never saw any other newspaper that I thought did that, and I think there ought to be one of that kind in the world.

What may be the outcome as a financial, moral or political success I do not know; but I would rather go down trying to do right than to succeed by a compromise.

With a conscience void of offense toward God or man, I can stand before the monument of the "Great Commoner" in our Lexington cemetery, and placing my hand upon my heart look up at his "counterfeit presentment" that towers to the skies, and say, "I would rather be right than President" of the Huffman Mill Turnpike Company.

### A Christian who Believes that God Raised me up to Edit the Blade.

TOLLESBORO, LEWIS CO., KY., Sept. 4, 1891.

Mr. C. C. Moore. Dear Friend and Brother Prohibitionist—I seat myself to pen you a few lines in answer to your request in the B. G. B. of August 29, in regard to your continuing to edit your paper.

While I think that you are the one to decide that, I thought I would write you a few lines to let you know what I had to say on the subject.

I am not able to be of any benefit to you so far as dollars are concerned, but if my good wishes and prayers are of any help to you, you can rest assured that you have them; for I do think that you come nearer pleasing me as an editor than any man I ever read after, and I think that the people need your paper, and that if you can, you should continue to edit it. I know of no other man who could come any way near filling your place as editor.

Now do not think, Bro. Moore that I take you to be as pure and spotless as the little prattler on his mother's knee; for I do not. I think that you are like the rest of the human family, after having grown to be men and women.

We have our faults, but I think that your faults as an editor are very small and few in number as compared with other editors.

I am satisfied from reading your paper that you are an honest gentleman; true to your own convictions, and bold and fearless in the proclaiming and defence of the same. And that is the man that we need at this present time for an editor, or leader of any kind.

But I am sorry to say that the majority of our leading men of different callings are not that way.

If they were, things would not be as they are to-day. If the preachers of our land and nation were true to the profession they make, and would vote as they pray, the liquor traffic would go out of our country like dry stubble before the fire. But let us not be discouraged, but press on, for the darkest hour is just before day.

I feel that with such men as you, as editors, the Prohibition morn will dawn before long. My faith is strong. I feel that you and I, my brother, will be permitted to see the destruction of the accursed whisky traffic on the American continent; for right is might and will prevail.

We learn from the reading of the Bible, that the Almighty raised up men for special purposes, and that all great and good men had their work to do, and I do believe my brother, that the God that made us and the people of this nation, made you as editor of the Blue Grass Blade, until the liquor traffic is a thing of the past. I think that surely is your calling. I think that such will be the case that the people that are able to help you will come to your assistance, and you will continue your excellent paper, in defence of the right, until the great wrong has been wiped out, and then I trust that your days, like Hese-kiah's of old, may be lengthened out fifteen years, and give you good time and opportunity to correct what errors you may have made in the excitement of the battle against King Alcohol.

Well I will close my remarks hoping my desire for you may come true. And I trust that if we never meet in time we may meet in eternity, among that number that have their robes washed white in the blood of the Lamb.

Truly Yours,  
W. H. RUMMANS.

While I have received the most substantial encouragement from some very wealthy gentlemen, it is a fact that no poor man has forsaken me, as far as I know; and only one woman has written me a discouraging letter.

I have received letters from the most cultivated and most pious women, and clear down to the inmate of a house of ill fame, all with the one exception, expressing all kindness and good wishes for me and my little paper.

The language of Bro. Rummans, who I imagine is a man well along in years, is thrilling to me. He does not read between the lines, and find the poisonous religious doctrine with which I am supposed to be laboring to infect the land.

My life is a wonder to me. Why, I, the only son of a very rich farmer, my life being principally passed in the retirement of a country home, without an instance of drunkenness in my family to suggest it, should now be absorbed, to the neglect of business interests, in this crusade against the liquor traffic, while I am commonly spoken of as an infidel, seems strange to me. I feel in myself the lack of the genius and moral courage and perseverance to make me a "hero in the strife", but somehow I do feel that I am "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord", and that there "cometh one after me the latchet of whose shoes I am unworthy to stoop down and unlatch".

The times are portentous and

mighty issues struggle for birth in the body of futurity. History is repeating itself, and men are talking just as they did when the great war chaldron was beginning to boil, that resulted in the overthrow of slavery.

The liquor traffic is the greatest outrage that ever cursed civilization.

The daily news from every point of the compass brings to us the accounts of the misery and degradation, ruin and death and worse than death—hell on earth, the fires of which are fed by fiends incarnate by the sanction of law; the cries of the widow and the orphan appeal to heaven like the blood of righteous Abel, and bold and grand and good men are coming to the rescue of these innocent sufferers, and this damned traffic will go down, and its infamous defenders will bite the dust, if it takes war and blood to do it.

In a little while, every man whose heart throbs in sympathy with the heroic Nazarene will come out from these churches, the bulwark of this traffic in human lives; and they will be an organized army under a white banner with a Cross on it, and this infamy and atrocity, this outrage upon civilization, this disgrace and stench in the nostrils of all true men will come to an end.

If the true men and women of this land do not combine their efforts against the clergy and politicians and editors who, for base and mercenary motives, are filling our cities and towns with these liquor hells, kept by the lowest and most depraved and ignorant of the offscourings of Europe, who are now controlling the affairs of the state and grasping at the control of the church, this government will never celebrate another centennial.

All other political and religious issues pale into insignificance before this stupendous sin, which, like the fabled bird of "Sinbad", spreads its black pinions from horizon to horizon, and hangs like the pall of doom over the destinies of this country.

Similarity Between the Vote for Josiah Harris in 1891 and Cassius M. Clay 1851.

(From the Southern Journal.)

The vote for Maj. Harris, Prohibition candidate for Governor at the August election, 1891, the last under the old constitution, was 3,293. The vote for Cassius M. Clay, Abolition candidate for Governor of Kentucky, at the August election, 1851, the first under the old constitution, was 3,261. In twelve years after that election the emancipation proclamation was signed. As a student of political conditions I am inclined to believe that in twelve years more the Prohibitionists will win.

D. J. THOMAS.

Wants me in the Lecture Field.

A long good cordial letter from Bro. Whaley at Cynthia, Kentucky wants to entertain me at his house, if I go into the lecture field. It speaks in most complimentary terms of Bro. Neal of "The Worker".

The letter closes as follows. "I see so much in the Blade that ought to be said elsewhere as well, that I can but commend it very largely. I never was a milk and cider man myself.

Christianity and whisky will not mix any more than oil and water.

I could write you Bro. Moore till you would get tired of reading it.

"The half has not been told."

Yours fraternally,  
S. W. WHALEY.

Bro. Goddard for the Blade and Woman's Rights.

WILDWOOD, KY., Sept., 16, '91.

BROTHER MOORE—Notwithstanding you will not issue my letters, come to see me at my home, or meet me at your office in Lexington, I write you to say that if you and Bro. Neal will unite in continuing the Blade you can put me down for five copies and a transferring of my stock in the old Blade to the new Blade.

Yours as ever for Prohibition and woman's rights, and more especially woman's rights.

W. W. GODDARD.

But suppose Bro. Neal had said in the Blade as he did to me in a letter, that he thought woman's suffrage "a greater menace to homes than the saloons," what would you have said Bro. Goddard? And wouldn't the Blade have caught it from Mrs. Sawyer, of London, and Mrs. Henry, of Versailles, and Mrs. Clark, of Lexington?

Mrs. Henry speaks of Prohibition and woman's suffrage as "The twins." They are regular Siamese twins. When you cut them apart they will both die.

Three cheers for Prohibition and four of them for woman's suffrage!

### ANTI-NUISANCE WORK.

IMPORTANT AND INTERESTING INVESTIGATIONS BY THE NATIONAL LEAGUE.

Is the Liquor Traffic a Crime? Is it a Nuisance? Can the Legislature Barter Away the Public Welfare? Is License Constitutional?

(Special Correspondence.)

The National Anti-Nuisance League is pursuing an investigation which is very interesting to social reformers. As is well known, the League intends to attack in the Courts the constitutionality of liquor license and revenue laws, and already some cases have been started with a view to test the matter.

Secretary John Lloyd Thomas of the League recently sent the following letter to 1,000 of the leading lawyers of the land, and to a number of statesmen:

NATIONAL ANTI-NUISANCE LEAGUE, 10 East 14th Street, NEW YORK, June 15, 1891.

DEAR SIR:—The U. S. Supreme Court in the case of California vs. Christiansen declared as follows: "The States have inherent rights in a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail; it is not a privilege of a citizen of a State, or of a citizen of the United States."

In the same decision the following statement was made: "The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than to any other source."

The National Anti-Nuisance League believes that it can be established by competent evidence that the liquor traffic is a constant menace to public and private morals, health and safety; that it diminishes property values, while advancing insurance charges and increasing taxes necessary to pay the expenses of courts, jails, hospitals and poor-houses largely due to this traffic. The League holds the opinion that such effects, general in their operation, constitute such a traffic a public nuisance.

The United States Supreme Court has also declared in Stone vs. Mississippi: "No Legislature can bargain away the public health or the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants. Government is organized with a view to their preservation, and cannot divest itself of the power to provide for them."

On these grounds the National Anti-Nuisance League proposes to test in the courts the constitutionality of National and State laws licensing or obtaining a revenue from the afore-said traffic. This purpose is encouraged by able lawyers in all parts of the country.

Will you kindly answer the questions on the enclosed circular and return it to the office? Our object is to secure a consensus of opinion from the ablest lawyers in the land, not only for our own information, but for the purpose of public enlightenment. Unless forbidden, we would like to publish your opinions over your own name. Trusting you will consider this matter of such great importance as to justify an early reply, we are, Sir, very respectfully,

JOHN LLOYD THOMAS, Secretary.

W. JENNINGS DEMOREST, President.

The following are the questions asked in this LEGAL INVESTIGATION: 1. Does your legal opinion bear out the statement made by the United States Supreme Court in the effect that "a greater amount of crime and misery is attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at liquor saloons than to any other source?"—U. S. Cal. vs. Christiansen.

2. Do you believe that such effects when traceable to a particular business would constitute it under the common law, a public nuisance? 3. If so, would not an injunction lie to restrain such a business? 4. In view of the U. S. S. C. decision in Stone vs. Mississippi, can a legislature bargain away the public health or the public morals, could a license or revenue law be pleaded against such an injunction?

5. Do you believe the laws licensing and taxing the liquor traffic are constitutional, and are the legislatures which "barter away the public health," etc., are justified by the Constitution in licensing the liquor traffic? 6. A large number of interesting replies have been received, some of which have already been printed. It is worthy of note that only three persons answer the first question in the negative, and the reply of Congressman Hayes of Iowa, is an example of them all. He says: "No. Any such statement is patent nonsense, not as any observer of criminal matters knows."

On the other hand, hundreds of the leading lawyers, ex-judges and legislators corroborate in strongest terms the statement made by the Supreme Court. The answer of Judge William H. Arnoux of New York city is a fair specimen of the replies to this question. He says: "Most assuredly. It is a conservative statement. A careful study of the question for years leads me to the conviction that double the amount of crime, poverty, disease and pauperism is due to intemperance than to all other sources combined."

John W. Kendall, Esq., of Kentucky, writes on this point: "As a practicing lawyer for twenty-five years and prosecuting attorney ten years, I will say that more crime and misery is attributable to the use of ardent spirits than all other causes."

The answers to the other questions vary widely. To the surprise of the investigation the corresponding answers to the questions expressed by the League, and declare that a business which is responsible for such results is a nuisance, and that license and revenue laws cannot be pleaded successfully in injunction proceedings.

Hon. Wm. M. Price, a Hancock and English elector, and now a prominent lawyer in Western Pennsylvania, is a fair example of these replies. He writes: 1. "I do.

2. Without doubt. 3. Not successfully, if the Court does not reverse itself. 4. I do not believe such laws Constitutional, and no legislature is justified in enacting such laws."

A few well known lawyers, however, take the ground that it is the province of the legislature to define a nuisance, and that license laws enacted by legislatures take the saloons out of the category of public nuisances. But other able lawyers maintain that the dictum of the Supreme Court, "No legislature can bargain away the public health and public morals," indicates that the legislature may transcend its powers or mistake its functions, and that the Courts may overrule such action.

One point has been brought out clearly in the investigation. The most conservative replies indicate the conviction that if the effort of the League fails it will not be because of the conservative, prejudice, favor or fear of the courts.

One lawyer closes his letter with

"I am convinced that the political party in power is favorable to such legislation, and the judges hold their offices by the grace of such party, such judges will not decide said laws unconstitutional."

This may be true but the League is determined to test the matter and see whether the U. S. Supreme Court will recede from its past declarations. W. Jennings Demorest, the Prohibition philanthropist, gives the movement his heartiest support.

In the meantime the Prohibition Party will work on to elect a party to power which will repeal the odious and unconstitutional laws which raise revenue from the crime, disease and pauperism of the people.

The following are selected as fairly representative of the different replies received. From Ex-Congressman Richard Vaux, of Philadelphia, Penn. 1. As to crime, No. As to pauperism, Yes.

2. "The Common Law" has been crucified between the selfishness of civilization and avarice.

3. Legislation has made such havoc of "Law" that it is now found in the prejudices and ignorance of "Courts."

4. That depends on the parties in the suit.

5. As to the Constitution, it is only now invoked to justify courts in their constant violation of the letter and spirit of that instrument.

From Hon. Henry Stockbridge, of Baltimore, Md. 1. It does.

2. I do not believe that it is so traceable as to constitute it "a public nuisance," at Common Law, by common sense, and especially and morally it is a nuisance.

3. The last answers this.

4. I think it could; but there are plenty of thoroughly temperance judges before whom such an issue could be tried. Try it.

5. I know of no constitutional provision with which they conflict it. A Constitution cannot justify anything that is unjust. It may permit many wrongs to exist. There are many things permitted by Constitution which legislatures ought not to do.

From ex-Senator Henry W. Blair, of Maine, Me. 1. It ought to be held.

2. If it should be so held by the courts, remedy would be indictment and injunction.

3. There must be a public opinion which will choose legislatures and create courts which will treat the liquor traffic as an outlawed thing.

4. I think it ought to be held to be constitutional. Public opinion, as manifested in written law must be changed. Your agitation by prosecution will help to create that opinion. I hope that will secure favorable decisions from the courts.

From the Hon. John P. St. John. 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. No. I have claimed for more than twenty years that all saloon licenses are void.

5. All such license or tax for beverage purposes are absolutely void, and

The Great Monopoly.

The question of prohibition concerns a monopoly far greater and more powerful than any other monopoly had to deal with. It is a monopoly that is crushing the life out of honest business at a rate we are paying it not less than \$800,000,000 a year directly, and indirect losses that \$200,000,000 more for the burdens it creates. And what good is there in it? What good does it do? The shoemaker produces shoes, the tailor clothes, the farmer food; but what does the liquor interest produce? It ruins homes, breaks mothers' hearts, degrades citizens and is everywhere a curse. It steals our boys and makes wrecks of them. It elects its own mayors, councils, representatives, Senators, members of Congress, and even the President; it elected Cleveland in 1884 and rather than kill the Republican party by another defeat and so precipitate the liquor question squarely, it elected Hill and Harrison in 1888, and the present administration has proved more friendly to the liquor interest than any other we have ever had; as the record of his appointments show.—Dr. John A. Brooks, at Willimantic.

Recruits for Rum.

The annual immigration for the last fifteen years has averaged about 500,000. The number landing during the year ending June 30, 1891, was 555,496, and increase of twenty-three per cent. over the year before, the largest increase since 1890.—Washington Sentinel, (Organ of the National Brewers' Association) Aug. 16th.

It is the holy duty of every man who loves this country, wants its liberties and free institutions preserved, and puritanical despotism destroyed, to see that all emigrants of such that have neglected to do so heretofore, take out the necessary papers in order to become naturalized. In every city, town and village there ought to be a standing committee for that purpose. If we want to succeed, we must do it at the ballot-box—Washington Sentinel Aug. 16, 1891.

Ingalls Tells Some Truth.

The address of ex-Senator John J. Ingalls at Monona Lake on Prohibition expresses what has been said so much by Prohibitionists. Coming from a man who has been so prominent in public life his words will be taken as full of meaning when he says: "For fear of offending the radical Prohibitionists, for fear of offending the brewery interest, for fear of offending the distillers of whisky, there is no one man in public life to-day that dares to tell the honest truth about Prohibition—not one."

This is John J. Ingalls who was one of the noble men referred to. It is no more patent to observant men that this is so because John J. Ingalls has said so, but it is well he has said it. Supposing Blaine would free his mind about prohibition. Would he be the nominee of the republican party the next election? Would Hill or Cleveland if they gave their views?

When men say "liquor traffic" some one is hit every time. There is not another question before the people, nor will there be for ages a question of such magnitude. It makes it no more the truth because a prominent man says so, but it drives it closer home. In the battle of the great giants that will come on this question, such other questions as arise up a strife in politics now will subside into insignificance in comparison.—Tavor.

Maine Liquor Men Arrested.

Alderman Henry Hines and four other wealthy residents of Lewiston, Me., were arrested recently charged with attempting to bribe Deputy Sheriff Odlin and Larrabee not to interfere with them in the liquor business.

### H. W. ALDENBURG,

ARCHITECT and SUPERINTENDANT.

161 West Main St., LEXINGTON, KY.

Represented by J. R. SCOTT.

VICTOR BOGAERT,

REPAIRING

AND

Manufacturer of Jewelry,

15 East Short Street

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY.

ESTABLISHED 1832.

HIRAM SHAW,

—Wholesale and Retail Dealer in—

Hats, Caps, Fanny Furs.

GENTLEMEN'S FURNISHING GOODS

Trunks, Valises, Umbrellas, &c.

No. 19 East Main Street, LEXINGTON, KY.

The S. P. Gross

Artificial Stone and Paving Company,

Office and Warerooms Nos. 131, 133, 135 E. 6th St.

LEXINGTON, KY.

Layers of Cement Work, Artificial Stone Sidewalks, Diamond walk, Plain Flagging, Malt Houses, Slaughter Houses, Ice Houses, Cellars. Any kind of Tiling laid. Vases, Drain Tile, Carriage Steps and Cistern Tops. Lawn Walks and Pavements a specialty. All kinds of Artificial Stone and Ornamental Work. Curb Stone, Gutter Flagging, Sewer and Drain Pipes, Drip and Step Stones, Fire Places, Furnaces. Dealers in all kinds of Sand, English and German, Portland Cement, etc. Plaster Paris and Lime.

All orders will receive prompt attention. All work guaranteed. The best of reference given. Address all communications to

S. P. GROSS General Manager

Painters Materials and Supplies.

Having dissolved partnership with L. P. Young, Jr., this is to notify my old patrons and friends that I will individually continue my business at

No. 2 NORTH BROADWAY,

in this city. And will keep on hand a full supply of Painters Materials, consisting of Glass, Leads, Brushes, and everything in that Department. I will contract to do House Painting in the most approved style and will furnish bids on short notice.

M. N. BARR.

D. H. BEATTY,